He goes on with other arguments and then sums it up this way: Accordingly, we hold that Plans D and C violate the 14th Amendment of the U. S. Constitution, and therefore do not comply with the July 27 order of this Court.

That is a square holding and that was firmly affirmed by the Supreme Court. In the affirmance, which is in 382 US, it was affirmed procurium, Mr. Justice Harlan wrote a concurring opinion in which, however, he noted that so far as he was concerned, that did not involve determination of the federal question, because the Plan A, which was approved by the District Court, had been based on a matter of state law.

In other words, they found that that complied with the state constitution, and therefore Mr. Justice Harlan felt that the federal question was not reached in their decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Henderson, you have one half minute.

DELEGATE HENDERSON: I am sorry.

There are a few other cases in which it has been